

### **AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS**

The attached "Replacement Sheets" of drawings include changes to Figure 3. The attached "Replacement Sheets," which include Figures 1-9, replace the original sheets including Figures 1-9.

New Figure 10 is added for consideration.

Attachment: Replacement Sheets

### **REMARKS**

Claims 1-7, 9, 10, and 13-21 are now pending in the application. By this paper, Claims 1-7, 9, 10, 13, and 16 have been amended, Claims 20 and 21 have been added, and Claims 11 and 12 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter contained therein. The basis for the foregoing amendments and new claims can be found throughout the specification, claims, and drawings originally filed. No new matter has been added. The preceding amendments and the following remarks are believed to be fully responsive to the outstanding Office Action and are believed to place the application in condition for allowance. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the objections and rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

### **DRAWING OBJECTIONS**

The drawings stand objected to under 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a) as failing to show various features of Claims 3 and 10.

Applicants submit herewith Replacement Sheets of drawings including amendments to Figure 3 and a New Sheet including Figure 10. In the "Replacement Sheets," Applicants have amended Figure 3 to include reference numerals (18) and (19) indicating hidden anti-backlash gears (18, 19) and have re-numbered each sheet based on the addition of Figure 10.

The anti-backlash gears (18, 19) are shown as being substantially aligned with the pinion gear (16) and engaging the ring gear (12). The foregoing relationship is described

in Paragraph [0042] of the substitute specification filed on October 8, 2008 and is shown in the originally filed version of Figure 3. No new matter has been added.

New Figure 10 depicts the ring gear (12) having anti-backlash gears (18, 19) mounted thereto. Support for new Figure 10 can be found in the originally filed specification at Page 8, lns. 14-19, for example. No new matter has been added.

In light of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that the drawings comply with 37 CFR 1.83(a). Reconsideration and withdrawal of the objections are respectfully requested.

#### **CLAIM OBJECTION**

Applicants have amended Claim 10 in accordance with the Examiner's suggestions and therefore respectfully submit that this objection is moot.

#### **REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112**

Claims 10-19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement.

Claims 1-7 and 9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention.

These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Regarding the rejection of Claims 10-19, the Examiner asserts that recitation of a first face of a first tooth and a first face of a second tooth necessarily refers to corresponding faces of the first and second teeth. Therefore, the Examiner asserts that

independent Claim 10 should be interpreted to include both of the anti-backlash gears being biased in the same direction. While Applicants do not concede the correctness of these assertions, Applicants note that independent Claim 10 has been amended to recite "wherein one of said first and second anti-backlash gears engages a first face of a tooth of the other of said first gear and said second gear, and the other of said first and second anti-backlash gears engages a second face of another tooth of said other of said first gear and said second gear." Applicants respectfully submit that independent Claim 10 is fully supported by the specification, drawings and claims originally filed.

Regarding the rejection of Claims 1-7 and 9, the Examiner asserts that independent Claims 1 and 9 are indefinite for requiring the teeth of the anti-backlash gear to be both substantially aligned with the teeth of the gear element and to be displaced from the teeth of the gear element. Applicants respectfully submit that independent Claims 1 and 9 do not concurrently recite substantial alignment and displacement, as the Examiner suggests.

Independent Claims 1 and 9 recite first and second anti-backlash gears having teeth configured so as to align substantially with teeth of one gear element, whereby the first anti-backlash gear is rotatably ***biased*** relative to the one gear element ***towards*** a position in which the teeth of the first anti-backlash gear are displaced from the corresponding teeth of the one gear element. Accordingly, independent Claims 1 and 9 do not recite the teeth of the first anti-backlash gear actually being displaced from the corresponding teeth of the gear element. Rather, the teeth of the first anti-backlash gear are biased **towards** a position in which the teeth of the first anti-backlash gear are displaced from the corresponding teeth of the gear element.

In light of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that independent Claims 1, 9 and 10, as well as Claims 2-7 and 13-19, dependent therefrom, are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

#### **REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 1, 3, and 4 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Laurent et al. (EP1199243A) in view of Vertemati (EP1174592A).

Claims 1-5, 10-14, and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Laurent et al. (EP1199243A) in view of Damas (U.S. Pat. No. 4,660,432).

Claims 6, 15, and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Laurent et al. (EP1199243A) in view of Damas (U.S. Pat. No. 4,660,432) as applied to Claims 4 and 10 above, and further in view of Berthelsen (U.S. Pat. No. 2,206,831).

These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Applicants respectfully submit that the cited art of record fails to teach or suggest the elements of independent Claims 1 and 10. Specifically, Applicants submit that the cited art of record fails to teach or suggest a first anti-backlash gear directly mounted on a gear element and a second anti-backlash gear mounted directly on the first anti-backlash gear in combination with the other features of Claims 1 and 10.

Vertemati discloses a primary synchronizing member (5b) mounted to a first side of a main drive body (5a) and a secondary synchronizing member (5c) mounted to a

second side of the main drive body (5a). See Vertemati at Col. 7, Ins. 21-31, and Figure 1. Damas discloses a gear wheel (2) driving a gear wheel (6) and first and second toothed wheels 8 and 10 disposed on opposite sides of the driven gear wheel (6). See Damas at Col. 2, Ins. 14-19, and Figure 5.

In light of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that independent Claims 1 and 10, as well as Claims 2-7 and 13-19, respectively dependent therefrom, are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

#### **ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER**

The Examiner states that Claim 9 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2nd paragraph.

The Examiner objects to Claims 7, 17, and 18 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but states that Claims 7, 17, and 18 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form.

Applicants acknowledge the allowable subject matter of Claims 7, 9, 17, and 18. Claims 7, 17, and 18 have not been rewritten in independent form, as Claims 6 and 10, from which Claims 7, 17, and 18 respectively depend, are believed to be in condition for allowance.

#### **NEW CLAIMS**

Claims 20 and 21 are added for consideration. Because Claims 20 and 21 depend from independent Claim 10, which is believed to be in condition for allowance in light of the

foregoing remarks, Claims 20 and 21 are likewise believed to be in condition for allowance.

#### **CONCLUSION**

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: May 14, 2009

By: /Matthew H. Szalach/  
Stephen T. Olson, Reg. 36,626  
Matthew H. Szalach, Reg. 53,665

HARNES, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.  
P.O. Box 828  
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303  
(248) 641-1600

STO:MHS:SDW

14219734 1